

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, paragraph [0034] has been amended.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 15, and 24 are requested to be cancelled.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 16-18, 21-23, 27, 35, and 41 are currently being amended.

Claims 3, 9, 14 and 44 are rewritten in independent form including all limitations from the base claim(s), and are being amended.

Claims 52-61 are being added.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 3, 6, 8-14, 16-23, and 25-61 are now pending in this application of which Claims 3, 9, 14, 28, 41, 44 are independent.

Claims 18-20, 29-31, and 51 are withdrawn pending allowance of a claim from which they depend.

Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, an objection was made to the abstract and an objection was made to the specification. Both objections are believed to be addressed by the amendments made in this response.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

On page 4 of the Office Action, Claims 10-16, 27, 35, and 41-50 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 10 contained the word “father” as did Claims 27, 35, and 41. The remaining claims were held indefinite for being dependent from one of these claims. Appropriate correction is believed to have been made to these claims, and these claims are believed to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

On pages 5-8 of the Office Action, Claims 1-13, 15-17, 21-28, 35-43, and 45-50 were rejected as anticipated by one or more of Kanda (5,316,369), Shafer (1,178,107), Jones (5,842,715), and Sakurai (5,529,265). The claims are addressed below by claim, noting all references cited against the claim.

A. Claims 28 and 35-40

Claims 28 and 35-40 were only rejected on page 7 of the Office Action as anticipated by Shafer (1,178,107). Claims 35-40 depend from Claim 28.

Claim 28 recites a “display.” Applicants appreciate that the examiner is interpreting this claim element in its broadest possible sense, but Applicants suggest that this term should be interpreted in its broadest possible sense consistent with the disclosure in the specification.

The specification “concerns a vehicle seat ... having an integrated display screen device” and states that “the display screen device can be, for example, a TV receiver, a video device, or a computer.” See paragraphs [0002] and [0003].

As one definition of display, the American Heritage dictionary provides “Computer Science. A video display.” *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000*. As one definition of display, Wordnet provides “an electronic device that represents information in visual form.” *WordNet ® 2.0, Princeton University 2003*. As one definition of display, Miriam Webster’s On-line Dictionary provides (as of September 2005) “an electronic device (as a cathode-ray tube) that temporarily presents information in visual form.” See also the Penguin Dictionary of Electronics, Third Edition, Market House Books, New York City, 1998.

Based on these accepted ordinary meanings of the term “display” in light of its use and description in the specification (particularly in paragraph [0003]), Applicants believe that the examiner has given the term “display” an unduly broad interpretation (which is even further supported in light of the present statements being made by the Applicants).

If the examiner feels that this is not a proper interpretation of Claim 28, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned so that the meaning of the claim can be clarified.

Claim 28 recites a display limited as discussed above. Shafer does not teach such a display. Rather, Shafer teaches a card holder 4 which is used to hold cards C. See Col. 2, lines 63-72.

Since Shafer fails to disclose at least one element of Claim 28 when properly interpreted in light of the specification, Shafer fails to anticipate Claim 28. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 28 is respectfully requested.

Claims 35-40 depend from Claim 28 and would be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 28.

Claims 29-31 depend from Claim 28 and have been withdrawn, but are requested to be reinstated if Claim 28 is found to be allowable.

B. Claim 3, 6, 8, 10-13, 15-17, 21-23, and 25-27

Claim 3 was rejected in view of Sakuri and Kanda. Claim 3 has been amended to recite “the spring member applying a return torque in the forward direction of travel.” (supported by at least paragraph [0033] of the specification). Neither Sakuri nor Kanda teach a spring member applying a return torque in the forward direction of travel. Thus, neither Sakuri nor Kanda anticipate Claim 3.

Claims 6, 8, 10-13, 15-17, 21-23, and 25-27 depend from Claim 3 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 3.

C. Claim 9

Claim 9 was rejected in view of Sakuri and Kanda. Claim 9 has been amended to recite “the damper member operating separately from the spring member.” (supported by at least paragraph [0033] of the specification). Neither Sakuri nor Kanda teach the damper member operates separately from the spring member. Thus, neither Sakuri nor Kanda anticipate Claim 9.

D. Claims 41-43 and 45-50

Claims 42-43 and 45-50 depend from Claim 41.

Claim 41 was rejected in view of Sakuri, Kanda, and Shafer. Claim 41 recites “wherein the display may be pivoted in the forward direction of travel by generating a first torque and may be pivoted farther in the forward direction of travel by generating a second torque of greater force than the first torque.” None of Sakuri, Kanda, and Shafer teach a system that upon the application of a first torque, pivoting can occur to within a certain distance, and upon application of a second torque, pivoting can occur beyond that certain distance – the pivoting occurring in the forward direction of travel. The certain distance is even more specifically recited in Claim 11.

Since none of Sakuri, Kanda, and Shafer teach at least one element of Claim 41, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 41 is respectfully requested.

Claims 42-43 and 45-50 depend from Claim 41 and would be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 41.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14 and 44 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 14 and 44 have been amended to remove the rejection under 35 USC § 112, and have been rewritten in independent form to overcome the objection as being dependent on a rejected base claim.

Allowability of Claims 32-34 if rewritten in independent form is gratefully acknowledged.

New Claims

Claims 52-60 have been added. Claims 52-60 are supported by the original disclosure and are not believed to add new matter. In particular, each of Claims 52-60 is at least illustrated in Figs. 2 and 5. Claims 53, 54, 56, 57, and 61 are at least further supported by Claims 10 and 11. Claims 58-60 are at least further supported by paragraph [0033].

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Sep. 15, 2005

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5839
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Marcus A. Burch
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 52,673